



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,547	08/22/2006	Yimwai Yau	USP3502C/SZ149-SZZ	8562
30265 7590 01/09/2009 DAVID AND RAYMOND PATENT FIRM 108 N. YNEZ AVE., SUITE 128 MONTEREY PARK, CA 91754				
EXAMINER				
GRABOWSKI, KYLE ROBERT				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3725				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/09/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/590,547

Applicant(s)

YAU, YIMWAI

Examiner

Kyle Grabowski

Art Unit

3725

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 3 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 August 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear what the second connector member is to receive in its connecting slot of the metallic connecting member. The claim reads "wherein said second connector member is arranged to mount with said resilient element and receive in said connecting slot of said metallic connecting member,..". For prosecution on its merits the claim is construed to mean "wherein said second connector member is arranged to mount with said resilient element and *to be received in* said connecting slot of said metallic connecting member,..". Furthermore, there is no proper antecedent basis for the term "mounting slot" and it is unclear what constitutes the "mounting slot".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Arruda et al. (US 6,806,867) in view of Aisenberg (US 2004/0233624). Arruda et al.

disclose a multi-functional cover 5 for a writing pad to incorporate a utility accessory 25

(e.g. PDA) thereto, comprising: a main body 20 having a display window formed 20a

thereon (Fig. 1A). Arruda et al. do not disclose a removable supporting frame or a

plurality of window connectors spacedly provided on a peripheral boundary of said

display window.

6. Aisenberg teaches a similar utility accessory interface 10 comprising

a supporting frame 30 detachably attached on said display window 32 of said main body

22, wherein said supporting frame 30 is adapted for detachably mounting with said

utility accessory 20 (0034, Fig. 2). The display windows 32 feature electrical window

connectors 34 which may be on the peripheral boundary, such as the top and bottom

edges, of the display window (i.e. the only appropriate "other" portion that is not does

not connect with the under surface of a utility accessory 20 (0033))

7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the utility accessory on the multifunctional cover taught in Arruda et al. with a supporting frame as taught in Aisenberg to allow for greater versatility allowing a plurality of different auxiliary modules (utility accessories) to be connected to the interface (Aisenberg, 0014).

8. Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arruda et al. in view of Aisenberg as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Dickie (US 6,961,237). Arruda et al. as modified by Aisenberg substantially disclose the claimed subject matter for the reasons stated above including that the supporting frame 30 comprises a frame holder which is quadrilateral in shape and has a plurality of accessory blockers formed at four corner portions of said supporting frame for retaining said utility accessory within said display window (Fig. 4); the window connectors 34 may comprise "multiple pin connectors" (0033) which inherently must pass through the supporting frame 30 (both the top and bottom) so as to ultimately attach the utility accessory 20 to the interface (0034); the supporting frame 30 may include a "conventional ejection system" including a "spring loaded system, to facilitate removal of an auxiliary module [utility accessory] 20" but do not disclose details of the spring loaded system.

9. Dickie teaches a similar invention of docking a PDA 102 into a display window 120 (Fig. 1); the supporting frame comprises a transparent panel (demarcated by lip

306), a biasing panel 300, and a rear panel 112 mounted in said frame holder for displaying said utility accessory by said supporting frame;

10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the multifunctional cover taught in Arruda et al. as modified by Aisenburg with the spring loaded system taught in Dickie to safely store the PDA (Col. 3, 48-51). All of the claimed elements were known in prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

11. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arruda et al. in view of Aisenberg as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Ross et al. (US 5,859,628). Arruda et al. as modified by Aisenberg substantially disclose the claimed subject matter for the reasons stated above but do not disclose specifics of the window connectors, only that they may constitute multiple pin connectors (with the supporting frame itself comprising the supporting member extending between them) situated around the periphery of the window boundary however Ross et al. discloses a similar PDA supporting frame having first and second window connectors 310 (Fig. 3); each window connector contains a tubular metallic connecting member having a slot therein for a resilient member, specifically "spring-DC contacts" which constitute springs which exert inward biasing forces (Col. 4, 19-39, Fig. 5); the second window connector, 310 is arranged to mount with the resilient element

and to be received in said connecting slot of said metallic connecting member such that the window connectors are capable of longitudinally moving with respect to said connecting slot.

12. Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herrera (US 2003/0012013) in view of Aisenberg (US 2004/0233624) and Tordera et al. (US 6,889,057). Herrera disclose a multi-functional cover 100 for a writing pad 103 to incorporate a utility accessory 105 thereto, comprising: a main body 101 having a display window formed 102 thereon (Fig. 1); a lighting device 107 spacedly mounted on the main body 101 powered by a power system (battery) 106, and selectively controlled by a switch 108 therebetween (0024, Fig. 1). Herrera does not disclose a removable supporting frame or a plurality of window connectors spacedly provided on a peripheral boundary of said display window.

13. Aisenberg teaches a similar utility accessory interface 10 comprising a supporting frame 30 detachably attached on said display window 32 of said main body 22, wherein said supporting frame 30 is adapted for detachably mounting with said utility accessory 20 (0034, Fig. 2). The display windows 32 feature electrical window connectors 34 which may be on the peripheral boundary, such as the top and bottom edges, of the display window (i.e. the only appropriate "other" portion that is not does not connect with the under surface of a utility accessory 20 (0033)). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the utility accessory on the multifunctional cover taught in Herrera with a supporting

frame as taught in Aisenberg to allow for greater versatility allowing a plurality of different auxiliary modules (utility accessories) to be connected to the interface (Aisenberg, 0014).

14. Herrera as modified by Aisenberg do not teach an audio device or external electrical appliance connected to the main body however Tordera et al. teach a similar supporting frame 12 as disclosed in Aisenberg for attaching a utility accessory (PDA) having a signal inlet (antenna) 40 for connecting with an external electrical appliance (wireless LAN/WAN) and an audio device. The audio device is provided to indicate communication between the signal inlet 40 and the external electrical appliance (Col. 1, 58-62). It would have been obvious to provide the multi-functional cover with a support frame as taught in Herrera as modified by Aisenberg with a signal inlet and audio device in view of Tordera et al. to provide a network connection to the utility device (Abstract)

Allowable Subject Matter

15. Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

16. None of the cited prior art anticipates or renders obvious all of the limitations of claims 1 and 2, and wherein said supporting frame further comprises a plurality of resilient members spacedly mounted at an inner side of said rear panel for normally applying an inward urging force towards said biasing panel so as to normally push said

utility accessory towards a front side of said supporting frame to be biased by said accessory blockers for displaying the utility accessory through said display window in a secure manner, *wherein said rear panel further has two pushing holes spacedly formed thereon for allowing a user to push said biasing panel and said transparent panel for conveniently detaching said utility accessory from said supporting frame.*

17. Dickie discloses resilient members to bias the biasing plate but does not disclose holes formed on the rear panel. There is also no motivation to form these holes with the cited prior art.

Conclusion

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle Grabowski whose telephone number is (571)270-3518. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dana Ross can be reached on (571)272-4480. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kyle Grabowski/
Examiner, Art Unit 3725

/Dana Ross/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3725